

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 12-22 are pending. Claims 1-11 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 12-22 are allowed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over the non-patent literature "Optical Properties of Reduced Lithium Niobate Single Crystals," of Dhar et al., Journal of Applied Physics 68 (1990) December, No. 11 ("Dhar"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dhar describes a study conducted on the optical properties of LiNbO_3 single crystals, where the study samples were unreduced and reduced samples. Dhar, section I, page 5804. Dhar describes that optical transmission data for samples was recorded in the wavelength range of 0.2 -0.9 μm , and that the absorption data coefficient α was calculated from this transmission data. Dhar, section II, right hand column, last paragraph, page 5804. Dhar, Fig. 2 depicts the calculated absorption coefficient α , as a function of photon energy. The ordinate axis of the graph ranges from 0 to 200 cm^{-1} , in increments of 25 cm^{-1} .

Claim 22 of the present application is directed to a nonlinear optical component produced according to the allowed process of claim 12, where the optical component “has a residual light absorption of less than 0.4mm^{-1} for light wavelengths in the range of about 500 nm to 1100 nm.” It is respectfully submitted that Dhar fails to disclose, or suggest, a residual light absorption of less than 0.4 mm^{-1} , as recited in claim 22. In contrast, Dhar merely describes that the plotted absorption coefficient α , for differing samples LN 0 - LN 5, asymptotes above zero. Nowhere does Dhar describe an absorption of less than 0.4 mm^{-1} , which would be 0.04 cm^{-1} , much less such an absorption in a range of about 500 nm to 1100 nm, as recited. Indeed, Dhar, Fig. 2 cannot be read to such a resolution. Accordingly, Dhar fails to disclose, or suggest, each and every feature of claim 22.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of the non-patent literature “Optical Properties of Reduced Lithium Niobate Single Crystals,” of Dhar et al. is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 12-22 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any unpaid fees deemed required in connection with this submission, including any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or 1.17, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 04-0100.

Dated: September 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant(s)